



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Conservation status of oyster reef ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia

Citation for published version:

Gillies, CL, Castine, S, Alleway, HK, Crawford, C, Fitzsimons, JA, Hancock, B, Koch, P, McAfee, D, Mcleod, IM & Zu Ermgassen, PSE 2020, 'Conservation status of oyster reef ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia', *Global Ecology and Conservation*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2020.e00988>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1016/j.gecco.2020.e00988](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2020.e00988)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Version created as part of publication process; publisher's layout; not normally made publicly available

Published In:

Global Ecology and Conservation

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Journal Pre-proof

Conservation status of oyster reef ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia

Chris L. Gillies, SarahA. Castine, Heidi K. Alleway, Christine Crawford, James A. Fitzsimons, Boze Hancock, Paul Koch, Dominic McAfee, Ian M. McLeod, Philine S.E. zu Ermgassen



PII: S2351-9894(19)30555-4

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2020.e00988>

Reference: GECCO 988

To appear in: *Global Ecology and Conservation*

Received Date: 9 September 2019

Revised Date: 25 February 2020

Accepted Date: 25 February 2020

Please cite this article as: Gillies, C.L., Castine, S., Alleway, H.K., Crawford, C., Fitzsimons, J.A., Hancock, B., Koch, P., McAfee, D., McLeod, I.M., zu Ermgassen, P.S.E., Conservation status of oyster reef ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia, *Global Ecology and Conservation* (2020), doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gecco.2020.e00988>.

This is a PDF file of an article that has undergone enhancements after acceptance, such as the addition of a cover page and metadata, and formatting for readability, but it is not yet the definitive version of record. This version will undergo additional copyediting, typesetting and review before it is published in its final form, but we are providing this version to give early visibility of the article. Please note that, during the production process, errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

© 2020 Published by Elsevier B.V.

Title: Conservation status of Oyster Reef Ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia

Chris L. Gillies^{*1,2}, Sarah.A. Castine³, Heidi K. Alleway⁴, Christine Crawford⁵, James A. Fitzsimons^{1,6}, Boze Hancock⁷, Paul Koch⁸, Dominic McAfee⁴, Ian M. McLeod², Philine S.E. zu Ermgassen⁹

¹ The Nature Conservancy, Suite 2-01, 60 Leicester Street, Carlton VIC 3053, Australia

² TropWATER, the Centre for Tropical Water and Aquatic Ecosystem Research, James Cook University, Townsville QLD 4811, Australia

³ Marine Solutions, 110 Swanston Street, New Town TAS 7008, Australia

⁴ University of Adelaide, Adelaide SA 5005, Australia

⁵ Institute of Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, 20 Castray Esplanade, Battery Point TAS 7004, Australia

⁶ School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Deakin University, 221 Burwood Highway, Burwood VIC 3125, Australia

⁷ The Nature Conservancy, c/o Graduate School of Oceanography, University of Rhode Island, 215 South Ferry Road, Narragansett, RI, 02882, USA

⁸ Future Ecosystems, Hahndorf SA 5245, Australia

⁹ University of Edinburgh, School of Geosciences, Changing Oceans Group, Grant Institute, James Hutton Road, Edinburgh EH9 3FE, UK.

***Corresponding Author:** Suite 2-01, 60 Leicester Street, Carlton, Victoria 3053, Australia.

E: Chris.gillies@tnc.org M: +61 412 663 506

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

Highlights

- The Oyster Reef Ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia was once common across eastern and southern Australia prior to the mid-twentieth century.
- Historical decline over the last 200 years has led to concerns over itsr conservation status
- The ecosystem was assessed as Critically Endangered using an IUCN Red List of Ecosystems assessment.
- The assessment found historic decline in ecosystem extent, low area of current occupancy and risk of collapse from future threats.
- The restorable nature of oyster reefs ecosystems provide a compelling case for new investment and protection mechanisms that can arrest their decline.

Abstract

Reef ecosystems all over the world are in decline and managers urgently need information that can assess management interventions and set national conservation targets. We assess the conservation status and risk of ecosystem collapse for Oyster Reef Ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia, which comprises two community sub-types established by *Saccostrea glomerata* (Sydney rock oyster) and *Ostrea angasi* (Australian flat oyster), consistent with the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems risk assessment process. We established: (i) key aspects of the ecosystem including: ecological description, biological characteristics, condition and collapse thresholds, natural and threatening processes; (ii) previous and current extent of occurrence and current area of occupancy; and (iii) its likelihood of collapse within the next 50-100 years. The most severe risk rating occurred for Criterion A: Reduction in Extent (since 1750) and Criterion D: Disruption of biotic processes (since 1750), although assessment varied from Least Concern to Critically Endangered amongst the four criteria assessed. Our overall assessment ranks the risk of collapse for the ecosystem (including both community sub-types) as Critically Endangered with a high degree of confidence. Our results suggest the need for rapid intervention to protect remaining reefs and undertake restoration at suitable sites. Several restoration projects have already demonstrated this is feasible, and Australia is well equipped with government policies and regulatory mechanisms to support the future conservation and recovery of temperate oyster ecosystems.

Keywords

shellfish reefs; oyster; marine conservation; ecosystem collapse; IUCN Red List of Ecosystems; risk assessment

Introduction

Shellfish reef ecosystems develop when high densities of shellfish, typically oysters or mussels, occur and form biogenic structures that function as ecosystem engineers and the foundation of the ecosystem. Shellfish reef ecosystems support important environmental characteristics, such as unique assemblages of associated fauna and valuable ecosystem services, including fish production, coastal protection, erosion mitigation, pH buffering and nutrient cycling (Coen et al. 2007). These services have been valued at between US\$5,500 and \$99,000 ha⁻¹ (2011 dollars; Grabowski 2012). Because of these valuable services, the protection and restoration of shellfish ecosystems are of interest to coastal managers as one potential natural solution to ameliorating the impacts of climate change, coastal eutrophication and habitat degradation (zu Ermgassen et al. 2016; Cohen-Shacham et al. 2019; McLeod et al. 2019a).

Shellfish reefs are globally distributed occupying intertidal and shallow subtidal zones in estuaries and on open coastlines across temperate and tropical environments. Today, however, over 85% of oyster reef ecosystems globally have been lost or degraded (Beck et al. 2011). Mechanisms for losses include: overharvest of shellfish and reef degradation from physical removal or breaking up reefs during harvest, changes in abiotic conditions such as salinity, sedimentation, hypoxia and flow due to upper catchment and shoreline modification, disease and pollution (Holmes 1927; Kirby 2004; Beck et al. 2011; Gillies et al. 2018; Pogoda 2019). Consequently, oyster reef ecosystems are considered one of the most imperilled and threatened marine ecosystems globally (Beck et al. 2011). Although their decline and associated need for conservation is increasingly recognised as a priority amongst conservation groups and professional science networks (e.g. Beck et al. 2011; zu Ermgassen et al. 2016; Fitzsimons et al. 2019; Pogoda et al. 2019; <https://www.shellfishrestoration.org.au>) there is a ubiquitous absence of protection (be it legal or policy) or global recognition of the threat of ecosystem collapse.

In Australia, oyster reef ecosystems can be formed by at least 14 different oyster and mussel species and occur in both tropical and temperate regions (Gillies et al. 2018). Of these species, there is reliable evidence that reefs formed primarily by *Ostrea angasi* (Australian flat oyster) or *Saccostrea glomerata* (Sydney rock oyster) have undergone considerable decline from historical distributions (Kirby 2004; Alleway and Connell 2015; Gillies et al. 2014; 2018; Ford and Hamer 2016). Here we provide a description of the ecosystem these species form and complete a risk assessment using the IUCN Red List of Ecosystem framework (<https://iucnrl.org/>) to assess the status of shellfish reef ecosystems formed by *O. angasi* and *S. glomerata* oysters. We term the ecosystem the 'Oyster Reef Ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia' (SEA Oyster Reefs) which comprises of two community sub-type developed by the above species. We assess the entire ecosystem and, where possible, provide specific information for each community sub-type. The risk assessment considers five criteria, each with three sub-criteria, to define numerical thresholds of threat from Least Concern (LC) through to Critically Endangered (CR) (Rodríguez et al. 2015). The approach is consistent with assessments made according to the IUCN Red List of Species and is similar to the Australian Commonwealth Government's environmental protection legislation (*Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*). Assessing the risk of collapse of ecosystems provides vital understanding about the mechanisms that can

affect, of the services the systems provide and species reliant on these systems, thereby informing appropriate governmental and intergovernmental protection levels and mechanisms (Rodriguez et al. 2015).

Ecosystem description and key biological characteristics

No single global definition of an 'oyster reef ecosystem' exists, largely because reef systems differ considerably according to their foundational species, location, surrounding abiotic attributes and biological processes. Kasoar et al. (2015, p. 982) provide the most quantitative and adaptable definition relevant to Australian oyster reef ecosystems: "Bivalve reef [ecosystems] consists of large areas of biogenic habitat, dominated by living bivalves where the complex structure of hard shells supports a distinct community that is persistent through time". Kasoar et al. (2015, p. 982) then expand on this general definition: "'large areas' typically consist of multiple patches, at least some of which are larger than 5 m²; 'dominated' means at least 25% cover of live shell matter across that space – non-living shell (cultch) may further add to habitat structure and to continuity over time, but without new growth they are unlikely to persist; a 'distinct community' is one that supports species and interactions that are rare or absent in surrounding communities; and 'persistent through time' describes communities that are likely to remain over 'decadal time scales or longer'".

Both *S. glomerata* and *O. angasi* provide the physical and biogenic structure and exhibit similar physical forms and biological composition. Structure occurs as either low-profile beds or high-profile reefs, which are developed through clustering of oysters, on soft sediments or hard structures, in high density. These species also support a similar community assemblage consisting of the same or similar functional species of mobile fauna, epifauna, fishes and microbiota (Crawford et al. 2019; McLeod et al. 2019b). Because both species provide a similar physical and biogenic structure and similar or identical ecosystem services in coastal environments (Figure 1) and are the most common reef-forming species in southern and eastern Australia, we considered these as two distinct community sub-types of a single ecosystem.

Based on historical and current observations collected on both community sub-types (Ford and Hamer 2016; Gillies et al. 2016; McAfee et al. 2016; Keane and Gardner 2018; Crawford et al. 2019; McLeod et al. 2019b) we provide a qualitative description of the physical form and functional features of SE Oyster Reefs at the patch-scale (i.e. network of reefs within an estuary, its most typical form of occurrence) to aid the delineation of reefs ecosystems compared to other ecosystems (i.e. oyster reefs versus dense populations of oysters within other ecosystems) (Table 1).

Abiotic environment and distribution

The abiotic envelope in which SEA Oyster Reefs ranges from estuarine to full marine waters in moderate to low energy environments (Edgar 2008; Gillies et al. 2015a). The ecosystem occupies the intertidal and subtidal zone between the mean high tide line to 30 m below sea level, in estuaries, bays, inlets, gulfs and coastal waters from southwestern Western Australia, eastward along the southern coast, including Tasmania, to south-east Queensland south of Bundaberg (Gillies et al. 2018). Oyster reef ecosystems formed by *O. angasi* typically occur subtidally, from low intertidal to a depth of 30 m and favour fully marine salinities. *S. glomerata*

typically occur in the intertidal zone within estuaries although historic evidence suggests reefs were common in subtidal areas down to at least 10 m (Smith 1981; Diggles 2013) and prefer more estuarine salinities (10-35ppt) (Dove and O'Connor 2007). Community assembles are functionally similar amongst both sub-community types with some overlap in species composition where ranges overlap (Crawford et al. 2019; McLeod et al. 2019b).

Current conservation classification

Shellfish Beds and Reefs are globally classified under the IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology (Keith et al. 2020) as ecosystems occurring within the Marine Realm, Marine Shelves Biome (M1.4). In Australia, Oyster reef ecosystems can be classified under the National Intertidal/Subtidal Benthic (NISB) habitat classification scheme (Mount et al. 2007) and Interim Australian National Aquatic Ecosystem Classification Framework (AETG 2012) as occurring in marine and estuary systems on unconsolidated substrate with a Structural Macrobiofa (SMB) dominated by a filter feeding assemblage. The ecosystem is classified under the Ramsar Classification System for Wetland Type (Ramsar 2012) and is defined as E7 'Bivalve (shellfish) reefs'.

Key natural processes

Oyster reefs typically form as successive generations of bivalves settle and grow on top of one another and persist by several key processes and interactions (Figure 2). The availability of clean substrate is a key requirement for regular recruitment and reef persistence, with oysters showing a preference for attaching to other living oysters (Rodriguez-Perez et al. 2019). This process aids the physical development of reefs and creation of a positive shell budget where new oysters settle onto live or dead oysters, elevating the reef from the surrounding substrate. A high spawning biomass, where survival of settled larvae through to maturity is greater than adult mortality is required to support reef growth and maintain dense aggregations (Powers et al. 2009).

The location of reefs and beds within an area can shift through time (across decadal time scales) and geological and Aboriginal cultural evidence of food middens indicates the potential of populations to persist for very long (at least centennial) time periods in a single location (Edgar and Sampson 2004; Gillies et al. 2015a). A combination of environmental parameters govern the position of oyster reef ecosystems within a seascape, including: wave exposure and currents, sedimentation, salinity, food availability and suitability of substrate for settlement. Both oyster species are subject to diseases, which are known to inflict significant mortality in aquaculture settings (Winter Mortality Syndrome known as QX for *S. glomerata* and *Bonamia exitosa* for *O. angasi*) (Nell 2001; Carnegie et al. 2014).

A key feature and biological process of oyster reef ecosystems is their capacity to capture food and nutrients from the water column and transfer them to the benthos, a process known as benthic-pelagic coupling (Newell 2004). The drawdown of plankton and seston from the water column through the filter feeding of oysters and the subsequent production of oyster biomass, faeces and pseudo feces, cleans the water-column and enriches the benthos with nutrients that underpin the productivity of benthic fauna and vegetative communities (Dame

et al. 1984; Newell and Koch 2004), while facilitating microbial activity that positively influence nitrogen and phosphate re-mineralization (Kellogg et al. 2013).

Historical and current threatening processes

Threats to SEA Oyster Reefs mirror global patterns (Beck et al. 2011). Historical threats were primarily unregulated resulting in over-harvest during the first 100 years of European colonisation and the use of destructive fishing equipment such as dredges (Smith 1981; Nell 2001). Oyster fishers used dredges, but also hand harvest methods, which broke up, removed or buried oysters and shell resulting in loss of oyster biomass, removal of settlement substrate, a decline in ecosystem function, and ultimately a shift towards an unconsolidated substrate. Abiotic factors such as historical and ongoing changes to land and water use in catchments and estuaries can threaten ecosystem formation and persistence by influencing the environmental conditions of an estuary (e.g. salinity, pH, dissolved oxygen, freshwater flow, tidal dynamics, sedimentation, shoreline availability, auto and allochthonous estuary primary production (Chan et al. 2002; Taylor et al. 2004; Thrush et al. 2004)). These drivers have a direct impact on oyster growth and survival by controlling the degree of smothering, water quality, availability of surface for recruitment, food availability, and predation (Lenihan and Peterson 1998; Nell 2001; Brumbaugh et al. 2006; Wasson 2010; Diggles 2013; O'Connor et al. 2015). The oxidation of sulfidic floodplain sediments and release of acidic waters (pH <6) into estuaries is particularly widespread in eastern Australia (Sammut et al. 1996) and causes significant mortality and stress in *S. glomerata* (Dove 2007), although oysters may be adapting (Amaral et al. 2011). Floods in historical and contemporary times are catastrophic threats, which can cause physical damage, abiotic changes in estuaries and precipitate the spread of diseases (e.g. QX, Winter Mortality) and parasites such as mudworm (Ogburn et al. 2007; Green et al. 2011; Diggles et al. 2013, Spiers et al. 2014). Current threats, in addition to the legacy of historical harvesting and catchment disturbance, include disease (described above), climate change (primarily through ocean acidification), altered temperature and salinity and resultant potential loss of suitable abiotic growing conditions (Parker et al. 2009; Gillanders et al. 2011), commercial and recreational fishing (Keane and Gardner 2018), and removal of available surfaces for colonisation through shoreline modification.

Definition of ecosystem collapse

Whilst the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems provides a mechanism to assess ecosystem collapse across the extent of the entire ecosystem, we were unable to find a definitions of degradation towards collapse at the local level (i.e. at a location – the scale at which most management is undertaken) in the literature for any shellfish reef ecosystem. We therefore provide a definition of ecosystem collapse for a reef system at the location scale derived from our cause-effect model (Figure 2), from the Interim Australian National Aquatic Ecosystem Classification Framework (AETG 2012) and common criteria used to measure the success of oyster reef restoration in the United States and Australia (Oyster Metrics Workgroup 2011; Baggett et al. 2015; Gillies et al. 2017; McLeod et al. 2019b).

The ecosystem has collapsed when there are no remaining locations dominated by living oysters and oyster shells. Spatial complexity and the presence of hard substrate will have significantly decreased (where not

occurring on otherwise hard surfaces (e.g. rock or mangrove roots). Microclimates and local hydrodynamics may also change. Species assemblages will shift from a diverse range of sessile and mobile reef-associated organisms, to a system that is predominantly characterised by infauna and deposit feeders (when shifting to soft sediments) or lower diversity and biomass of reef-associated species when shifting to bare rock/mangrove). Indicators of ecosystem decline at the patch-scale can be observed by measuring density of oysters, oyster recruitment, survival and growth (Table 1).

Risk assessment methods

Following the methods of Keith et al. (2013) and guidelines of Rodriguez et al. (2015), we conducted a risk assessment to determine the risk of collapse of the SEA Oyster Reefs comprising the community sub-types *S. glomerata* and *O. angasi*. Five criteria and three sub-criteria, developed for the IUCN's Red List of Ecosystems (Rodriguez et al. 2015; <https://iucnrl.org/>), formed the framework of the risk assessment. These were: *Criterion A*) rates of decline in ecosystem distribution; *Criterion B*) restricted distributions with continuing declines or threats; *Criterion C*) rates of environmental (abiotic) degradation; *Criterion D*) rates of disruption to biotic processes; and *Criterion E*) quantitative estimates of the risk of ecosystem collapse. The sub-criteria in each primary criteria define timeframes for the assessment period (e.g. past 50 years, next 50 years and since 1750), over which decline (or degradation) in ecosystem extent (or function) can be assessed (see Table 2 for all criteria and sub-criteria). Metrics, defined in Keith et al. (2013), were used to assign one of six risk categories to the ecosystem for each sub-criterion and included: data deficient (DD), least concern (LC), near threatened (NT), vulnerable (VU), endangered (EN) and critically endangered (CR).

Sources of data and assessment methods

Criterion A: Reduction in geographic distribution

For Criterion A, we used the published literature sources of Gillies et al. (2015, 2018), which provide data at the national scale and several other studies which described historical distributions at regional scales (i.e. state jurisdiction: Kirby 2004; Ogburn et al. 2007; Diggles 2013; Alleway and Connell 2015; Ford and Hamer 2016; Thurstan et al. In Press) as a proxy for ecosystem distribution, since no current or previous distribution maps exist. We assessed historical distributions at the location level with knowledge of present distributions published in Gillies et al. (2015), Jones and Gardner (2016) and McLeod et al. (2019b).

Information from the above studies consisted of a mix of primary and secondary sources that include: early explorer accounts, fisheries and government reports, commercial fishery surveys, first person accounts (published in newspaper articles), archaeological excavations (aboriginal middens), sediment cores, place names and reviews of fisheries legislation. Most of the scientific studies described the ecosystem in the context of wild oyster fisheries/oyster harvest and used a combination of fisheries harvest records, cultural histories, eyewitness accounts and parliamentary records as attesting to and recording the decline of oyster populations and describing the collapse of fishing, but also of oyster reefs. Since very few of these accounts

and papers provide information of ecosystem distribution within a location, we measured ecosystem decline as presence/absence of the ecosystem at each recorded historical location.

Criterion B: Restricted geographic distribution

For Criterion B we used ecosystem mapping and distribution data provided by Gillies et al. (2018), which compiles data from several studies (Diggles 2013; Alleway and Connell 2015; Gillies et al. 2015a; Warnock and Cook 2015; Ford and Hamer 2016; Jones and Gardner 2016). These studies use methods such as side scan and multibeam sonar, GPS mapping, aerial photos, harvest reports and eyewitness accounts to determine current ecosystem distribution.

Area of Occupancy (AOO) was calculated from these data using a single point for each of the known locations in which the ecosystem is found. A 10 km grid map was constructed over the entire distribution of the ecosystem. We chose to include all grid cells even when the ecosystem occupied <1% because of the small patch sizes associated with the ecosystem (i.e. typically 100 m² to 2000 m²). The level of uncertainty around this calculation is relatively high. The AOO map and calculations were performed using the GDA94/ Geoscience Australia Lambert Projection. To calculate Extent of Occurrence (EOO), a minimum convex polygon (no internal angles are >180°) enclosing all the data was then created in ArcGIS.

Criterion C: Environmental degradation

For Criterion C, we used three variables to quantify environmental degradation of the ecosystem. Firstly, we use catchment land use as an indicator of the variable *sediment load* in estuaries (Chan et al. 2002; Taylor et al. 2004; Thrush et al. 2004). Increased sediment is known to be a primary inhibitor of oyster reef development and persistence, whereby high sediment loads can cause death by smothering, inhibiting oyster settlement or enhancing oyster parasites and disease such as mudworm (Ogburn 2007; Fitzsimons et al. 2019). The eastern and southern coasts of Australia have undergone significant changes in land use since European settlement (Mansergh et al. 2006) and the casual impact this has had on altering river and estuary ecosystems is well known (Prosser et al. 2001).

To determine the level of severity in the indicator *sediment load*, we analysed the most current (2017) Catchment Scale Land Use of Australia data set (<https://data.gov.au/dataset/catchment-scale-land-use-of-australia-update-2017>). We used percentage of land use change within each associated catchment and applied the relevant IUCN thresholds: i.e. where more than 80% of the catchment had been classified as either 'land for production use' or 'intensive use' this corresponded to a high severity level for that location (i.e. high degree of environmental degradation) and a corresponding severity risk rating of Critically Endangered. Where more than 50% was classified as land under production or intensive use, we classified the location as having a severity risk rating of Endangered and where there was more than 30% of land for production use or intensive use this corresponded to a severity risk rating of Vulnerable. To determine threat extent, we use the proportion of catchments across the ecosystem's distribution which contained a threat rating.

Secondly, we use extent of estuary shoreline modification as an indicator of *substrate simplification*. Modified shorelines can alter or remove abiotic conditions suitable for ecosystem growth and persistence (i.e. elevation, slope, wave energy dynamics, substrate type, availability of hard surfaces). We quantified the percent of shoreline loss by selecting a 2 km buffer around estuaries with historical reefs as the analysis area, then calculated the percentage of different land use types for each estuary. We calculated the percentage of land classified as nature conservation areas/minimal use and the percentage of land calculated as urban intensive uses (including residential, commercial buildings, transport infrastructure) for each estuary within this area. We assigned threat categories to each location using the same method described above.

Thirdly, to assess future threats, we identified the main drivers likely to affect biotic and abiotic interactions of oyster reefs from a broader list of key threatening processes for coastal and estuary systems identified from Department of Climate Change 2009), Gillanders et al. (2011), Hobday and Lough (2011) and Clark and Johnstone (2017) and derived the associated impact of the stressors on oyster reef ecosystems from the literature (see *Historical and Current Threatening Processes* section above, also summarised in Figure 2 and Table 3).

Collectively, these three indicators were used to demonstrate plausible relationships between catchment change as the primary driver of several abiotic stressors that are known to affect ecosystem growth and persistence. These connections are highlighted in our ecosystem conceptual model (Figure 2).

Criterion D: Disruption of biotic processes or interactions

For Criterion D, we selected the biotic indicator *abundance of key species* (oysters) as the primary mechanisms to assess decline in altered biotic interactions. Oyster reefs in their reference condition, are characterised by high densities of oysters which provide habitat, shade, food and shelter for a diverse flora and fauna assemblage. Oysters are an ecosystem engineer and loss of oyster biomass to levels defined as a collapsed state (Table 1) disrupts fundamental biotic processes that sustain reef persistence and creation on which most reef-associated flora and fauna rely. Assessment was made by considering (qualitatively) the strength of the drivers identified in Criterion C against published data on the effect of biotic processes and interactions. Where the ratio of oyster recruitment through to reproductive or mature age is higher than oyster mortality, the ecosystem can feasibly exist in a steady state or expand in size and maintain a shell budget. Where recruitment is limited, or when oysters are unable to survive to maturity the ecosystem will either maintain a steady state or where mortality exceeds recruitment, the ecosystem will decline.

Criterion E: Quantitative analysis that estimates the probability of ecosystem collapse

We did not conduct an assessment against Criterion E, due to the small and isolated number of remaining reefs each occurring in different estuary systems. The complex hydrodynamics associated with estuaries and coarse nature of the available time series data inhibits an ecosystem-wide quantitative assessment of future collapse over time series of 50-100 years. We therefore classified Criterion E as Data Deficient.

Journal Pre-proof

Results

The assessment revealed different levels of threat detectable by different indicators from Data Deficient to Critically Endangered, with all of the four main criteria assessed having at least one of the three sub-criteria with a risk rating equalling Vulnerable (Table 2). Overall the degree of confidence in the data varied (e.g. high degree for Criteria A, since 1750) to less confidence (e.g. Criteria D, past 50 years). Two of the four criteria assessed against the 'Since 1750' time category were assessed as Critically Endangered and these were consistent when analysed for both sub-community types. Both sub-community types had similar risk ratings, and met similar criteria for assessment as Critically Endangered, although the *O. angasi* sub-community was assessed as particularly high for several criteria (A,B) because of its highly restricted geographic distribution. Overall, and as per the IUCN Red List for Ecosystems methodology, taking the highest risk rating, SEA Oyster Reefs were assessed as Critically Endangered.

Criterion A: Reduction in geographic distribution

A1: Reduction in the past 50 years

Gillies et al. (2018) identified seven locations which currently contain SEA Oyster Reefs, only one of which contains the *O. angasi* community sub-type. Two additional locations for *O. angasi* community subtype have recently been identified in Tasmania and Victoria (pers. obs) but these have yet to be assessed. Likewise, in New South Wales, anecdotal evidence exists for *S. glomerata* reefs in other locations (NSW DPI 2019) not identified by Gillies et al. (2018), yet these have yet to be mapped or verified as reef ecosystems. Current verified best estimates therefore indicate that only seven (but potentially nine) of an estimated 178-303 (lower-upper estimates, Gillies et al. 2018) historical locations (i.e. bays, estuaries, embayments) contain a remnant of the ecosystem (inclusive of both community subtypes).

Ford and Hamer (2016) provide evidence that limited oyster harvesting (30 tonnes per year) still occurred in Port Phillip, Victoria, up until the mid-twentieth century indicating that reefs or dense beds were still present around 50 years ago in that region although the extent to which these were *O. angasi* compared to *Mytilus (edulis) galloprovincialis* (blue mussel) which were also harvested at the time is unknown. In all other locations, reports of collapse for the ecosystem had occurred prior to 1950 (Kirby 2004; Diggles 2013; Alleway and Connell 2015; Ford and Hamer 2016; Gillies et al. 2018; Thurstan et al. In Press). Despite the potential for decline within the last 50 years, evidence of recent loss is limited and further work needs to be undertaken to address this knowledge gap. We therefore conclude that the status of the ecosystem under this sub-criterion (i.e. past 50 years) is Data Deficient.

A2: Reduction over the next 50 years

We infer the risk of future ecosystem collapse over the next 50 years will be based largely on the extent to which further environmental degradation occurs, since the primary historical stressors (harvesting through dredge methods, massive land use change) have largely abated and are unlikely to reoccur in all Australian

states where the ecosystem is found. There was also insufficient data to project a quantitative estimate of the future distribution and we assess the status here as Data Deficient.

A3: since 1750

Gillies et al. (2018) described the decline in the *O. angasi* sub-community from 118 historical locations (most conservative estimate) to just one location known today, a decline of over 99%. For *S. glomerata* community sub-type, only 6 of 60 historical locations (conservative estimate) have been identified, resulting in a 90% decline. Collectively for the ecosystem, the most optimistic national assessment indicates seven of 178 historically known locations still occur today, resulting in a decline of 94%. Gillies et al. (2018) conclude that ecosystem decline occurred primarily over a 150-year period from 1800 to 1950 which coincided with the peak wild oyster harvest fishery, landscape modification for the primary purpose of agriculture, forestry and urbanization, and industrialization of coastal areas and estuaries across south-eastern Australia (Gillies et al. 2015a, 2018).

Kirby (2004) described the collapse of all natural oyster fisheries (primarily *S. glomerata*) in New South Wales and southeast Queensland by 1910 which is similar to Ogburn et al.'s (2007) estimate that New South Wales subtidal oyster reefs (primarily *S. glomerata*) were in decline by 1880. In Victoria, Ford and Hamer (2016) describe >90% loss of *O. angasi* reefs in Port Phillip, Western Port and Corner Inlet coastal systems by 1860, although oyster fisheries were able to continue at much lower biomass until 1970. Alleway and Connell (2015) describe a collapse of the *O. angasi* fishery and reefs across at least 1500 km of coastline in South Australia by 1944. Warnock and Cook (2015), describe the loss of oyster beds (*O. angasi*) in southwest Western Australia estuaries by 1940. At the estuary scale, Diggles et al. (2013) describes collapse of subtidal *S. glomerata* communities by 1920 and Edgar and Samson (2004) indicate a 100% decline of *O. angasi* beds in the D'entrecasteaux Channel, Tasmania, by 1930.

Based on the weight of evidence from the above studies, the rate of ecosystem decline after European settlement was rapid and directly associated with an increase in commercial harvest which had largely ceased across the ecosystem's distribution by 1920. We therefore assess the status of the ecosystem under sub-criterion A3 is Critically Endangered (including for both sub-communities) with a degree of certainty 'Very Likely'.

Criterion B: Restricted geographic distribution

B1: Extent of Occurrence

The minimum convex polygon encompassing all confirmed remaining sites (7) encompasses an Extent of Occurrence (EOO) of 73,250 km², which, when using the process of Bland et al. (2017), is considered as 'Least Concern'. We also re-ran the assessment separately for the *S. glomerata* sub-community which provided an

EEO of 47,541 km². The current single location known for *O. angasi* would equal an EEO of <1km² (Keane and Gardner 2018).

Criterion B1-B3 also requires an assessment of the number of threat-defined locations (defined as a geographically or ecologically distinct area in which a single threatening event can rapidly affect all occurrences of an ecosystem type, Bland et al. 2017). For the *O. angasi* sub-community, only a single population is known to occur in north-eastern Tasmania making this sub-community type extremely vulnerable to single catastrophic events such as floods, droughts, storms, and potentially, recruitment failure if the existing commercial oyster fishery were to cause local depletions (Keane and Gardner 2018). We therefore categorized this region as a single threat-defined location. For the *S. glomerata* sub-community, populations in NSW and south-eastern Queensland can be exposed to single catastrophic events across the entire region (specifically land and marine heatwaves and droughts) but also other events which can affect one or more catchments (e.g. east coast flooding, hypoxic black water events) at one time but are unlikely to affect the entire ecosystem extent. From a management view, in NSW, all reef locations are located within the Coastal Vulnerability Area, a spatial zone defined under the NSW *Coastal Management Act 2016* which is identified largely because it has the same coastal threats and vulnerability. Regardless of whether one threat-defined location (entire region- heatwaves and droughts) or six threat locations (catchments-floods and blackwater events) are identified, the risk rating would be the same (i.e. ≤ 10 , Vulnerable). We therefore classified the *S. glomerata* sub-community as Vulnerable and based on the extremely low EEO and single threat-location, we classified the *O. angasi* sub-community as Critically Endangered. SEA Oyster Reefs as comprising both sub-community types were classified as Least Concern (Extent of Occurrence is >50,000 km²).

B2: Area of Occupancy (AOO)

We identified seven out of a total of 193 cells (3.6%) as occupied by the ecosystem (Figure 3), although in several estuaries the area of occupancy is likely to only occupy <1% of the grid cell (i.e. less than 1 km² as indicated by McLeod et al. (2019b), demonstrating the ecosystem is currently severely fragmented. Yet because of the uncertainty of the total area occupied at each location (i.e. not all reef patches were mapped at each location by McLeod et al. (2019b) we were cautious and included all cells within our assessment. A grid count of seven cells indicates a risk rating of Endangered (≤ 20 cells and less than five threat locations, included –see B1 above). We therefore assess the risk rating for 2B as Endangered, with *S. glomerata* sub-community type (6 grid cells) assessed as Endangered and *O. angasi* (1 cell) Critically Endangered.

B3: Number of threat-defined locations

The ecosystem can be considered Vulnerable (the only threat category available in this sub criterion) because it meets the criteria of occurring in less than five threat-defined locations and both sub-community types are

vulnerable to complete collapse from single catastrophic events (described above) which could occur in the immediate future and over a short period of time.

Criterion C: Environmental degradation

C1: The past 50 years

Due to the difficulty in linking drivers and threats relating to biotic degradation across the ecosystem's entire extent to the past 50 year time horizon only, we were unable to complete an analysis for this sub-criterion and we classified this as Data Deficient.

C2: The next 50 years

Of the 25 coastal and estuary drivers and threats identified in Australia by Clark and Johnston (2017) seven have the potential to cause ecological collapse of SEA Oyster Reefs by altering abiotic conditions that control both the abiotic and biotic conditions required for ecosystem persistence (Table 3). All but one of these threats (low-oxygen dead zones) are expected to deteriorate further in the future in southern and eastern Australia (Gillanders et al. 2011; Clark and Johnstone 2017), posing a higher risk of collapse to the ecosystem compared with today. In particular, 'climate and weather' is considered to have a 'very high impact' on Australia's bays and estuaries, with mean annual rainfall expected to decrease, storm events increase and sea level rise expected to be higher for south-eastern Australia compared to the global average (Department of Climate Change 2009; Hobday and Lough 2011; McInnes et al. 2016). These current and future threats which are expected to increase in intensity in the near future, provide a high level of confidence that the ecosystem is at risk of future collapse within the next 50 years. However, we assessed this criterion as Data Deficient because whilst there is certainty that threats will increase in the near future and are likely to have an impact on oyster populations, we were unable to determine the likely adaptive response of the ecosystem (see Discussion).

C3: since 1750

The relative severity of catchment modification as a driver of the abiotic stressor *sediment supply* equated to threat rankings ranging from Least Concern to Critically Endangered, with 90% of all extant sites (n=198) assessed as Vulnerable or higher (Table 4). This resulted in a Vulnerable risk rating for this indicator because the assessment meets the assessment of >30% degradation across >80% of the ecosystem extent. Similarly, 86% of catchments (n = 178) assessed for estuary shoreline modification as a driver of *substrate simplification* had a high degree (>50% degradation, Table 4), resulting in an overall risk rating of Vulnerable. Collectively for these two indicators our assessment suggests a plausible threat of historical environmental degradation as a result of catchment and estuary shoreline modification across most of the extent of the ecosystem. We thus assessed this criterion as Vulnerable with a high degree of certainty.

Criterion D: Disruption of biotic processes

D1: The past 50 years

Only one study in a single location (Sydney) has observed an increase in natural oyster (*S. glomerata*) abundance over the last 50 years (Birch et al. 2014). In aquaculture, oyster production has declined by half since peak production in mid 1970s, in part attributed to disease (Winter Mortality Syndrome) and declining water quality (White 2001; NSW DPI 2016). Whilst these drivers are likely to also have affected wild oyster populations, unfortunately, no similar long-term assessment of wild oyster populations or recruitment have been published. We therefore assess this sub criteria as Data Deficient.

D2: The next 50 years or any 50-year period

Projections of distribution and biomass of oyster ecosystems in the next 50 years are limited and the status of the ecosystem under this sub-criterion was considered Data Deficient.

D3: Since 1750

Several studies have previously documented collapse of the ecosystem as a result of oyster extraction (Ogburn et al. 2007; Lergessner 2008; Diggles 2013; Alleway and Connell 2015; Gillies et al. 2015a, 2018; Ford and Hamer 2016, Thurston et al. In Press), though only three have quantified decline in oyster abundance or biomass. Thurston et al. (In Press) document total collapse of the ecosystem, estimating a 96% decline in *S. glomerata* fisheries production in 2016 compared to the peak of the fishery in 1891. Alleway and Connell (2014) document a similar (96%) decline in harvest records for *O. angasi* between 1886-1944 and Ogburn et al. (2007) indicate a 66% decline in both *S. glomerata* and *O. angasi* production in New South Wales.

It was relatively common for historical accounts to describe vast oyster systems ranging from several hundred square meters in length to several kilometers which were intensively harvested for oysters. For instance:

The Fisheries Inspector for Moreton Bay, Fison (1984) reported for *S. glomerata* in Pumicestone Passage, Queensland:

“33 thousands of bags of oysters have been taken, they being in some places four and five feet deep, Mr Freeman having informed me that he has made his boat fast to a stake, and dredged for six weeks”

The New South Wales, Royal Commission on Oyster Culture (1876-7) reported for *S. glomerata* in Port Stephens, New South Wales:

“In the 1860’s a man could work his warp stake into the bed and not leave that spot for sixteen or twenty days, getting fifteen to twenty bags a day all that time. For a long time ten to twelve or even fifteen boats were so employed until only three or four bags could be got . . . some came back in about three years only to get at most six or seven bags per day”.

The Illustrated *Australian News* (Anon.) (7 November 1891, p. 8-9) reported for *O. angasi* in Port Albert, Victoria:

“An account of oyster dredging offshore from Corner Inlet describes an oyster bank ‘from Shallow Inlet towards Wilson Promontory for a distance of 12 miles’ and another ‘3 miles long beginning at the (Corner) Inlet’”

Harvest records, whilst not comprehensive, provide an insight into the extent of oyster biomass (typically mature oysters) extracted during previous commercial harvest. For instance, in Western Port, Victoria, during the mid-1850s, 1.2 million dozen oysters were removed per year (Ford and Hamer 2016). In southeast Queensland, harvest records began in 1874, with an estimated peak in 1891 recording removal of 2- 3.65 million dozen oysters per year (Thurstan et al. In Press) and in South Australia, during the 1880s over 100,000 dozen oysters were harvested per year (Alleway and Connell 2015). Further examples from individual estuaries and industries can be found in Gillies et al. (2015a; 2018, Table 3) and Thurstan et al. (In Press). In all circumstances the wild harvest industry collapsed, which often prompted early attempts at aquaculture and ranching (e.g. the laying down of oysters or substrate, Roughley 1922), before modern cage aquaculture begun in the early 1950s.

A lack of modern data on oyster densities from historical locations and quantitative estimates on historical abundance or biomass precluded a quantitative assessment of decline for known sites. Nonetheless, since the above studies describe extensive reef systems that were intensively harvested across the entire extent of the ecosystem and with most of these studies concluding total collapse of the ecosystem primarily as a result of oyster harvest, we believe there is sufficient evidence to reasonably deduce that the relative severity related to loss of oyster biomass causing ecosystem decline is $\geq 90\%$ of past biomass (all studies indicate ecosystem collapse through loss of oysters) and the extent of threat was $\geq 90\%$ of past extent (studies cover the full geographic range of the ecosystem). We therefore assessed the status of the ecosystem under this sub-criterion as Critically Endangered with a medium degree of confidence.

Discussion

Status of the Oyster Reef Ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia

We assessed the conservation status of the Oyster Reef Ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia using the IUCN framework and determined that the ecosystem (including both sub-communities) should be classified as Critically Endangered, the most severe risk rating. A Critically Endangered assessment was given for Criterion A: Reduction in Extent (since 1750) and Criterion D: Disruption of Biotic Processes (since 1750), while other criteria (Criterion D: Disruption of Biotic Processes (past 50 years)) was assessed as Least Concern. Overall the ecosystem met the listing requirements for all criteria but not for all sub-criteria, with the exception of Criterion E: Quantitative Analysis, which we were unable to assess. The level of confidence also varied among and within criteria. For instance, we found sufficient evidence to quantify the decline in ecosystem extent and oyster biomass throughout the 1800s (largely due to the well documented decline in the wild oyster harvest industry) yet there was little information on the extent of decline over the last 50 years. This result validated Alleway and Connell's (2015) observation of shifting baselines for shellfish ecosystems related to loss of memory in recent generations where the general visibility and awareness of oyster reef ecosystems, predominantly over the past 50 years, has been low.

Our assessment and the IUCN Red List process may be of value for other shellfish ecosystems, particularly those that are likely to have undergone significant decline (Beck et al. 2011) and are actively being restored, such as *O. edulis* in Europe, *O. chilensis* and *Perna canaliculus* in New Zealand, *C. virginica* and *O. lurida* in the United States and *C. hongkongensis* in Hong Kong (Fitzsimons et al. 2019). A detailed understanding of ecosystem definition, collapse thresholds and ecological risks can help to inform priority locations for protection and restoration and assist with developing methods for restoration by describing key ecosystem functions and structural attributes, which can guide the development of reference models (Gillies et al. 2017). Even if an ecosystem assessment does not meet any risk thresholds, undertaking the process itself can reveal new insights into the ecosystem (including gaps in understanding), and if undertaken regularly, can be used to monitor the status of the ecosystem over time (Alaniz et al. 2019).

A significant gap in our understanding of this ecosystem is how it will respond to future threats, particularly from climate change. Stressors such as altered water flow, salinity, hypoxia, heat stress and ocean acidification are already increasing or expected to increase in Australian estuaries (McInnes et al. 2016; Clark and Johnstone 2017), yet there is an insufficient number of recent studies that can confidently predict how estuarine, and particularly shellfish, ecosystems are likely to respond (but see Watson et al. 2009; Gillanders et al. 2011; McAfee et al. 2017; Parker et al. 2017). SEA Oyster Reefs have the potential to migrate within an estuary and could conceivably colonise new estuaries to avoid stress and remain within physiological thresholds, but this is assuming sufficient substrate and oyster biomass is available for local recruitment, settlement and reef creation. We suggest future research should prioritise the development of climate response ecosystem models to understand whether changing climatic factors will exacerbate the identified risk of total collapse and to help identify areas for future protection and management.

There is growing anecdotal evidence that a number of unmapped *S. glomerata* reefs may exist in New South Wales (NSW DPI 2019) which still require verification as oyster reefs. Oyster reefs may also be establishing on abandoned oyster leases and these are the focus of new restoration sites by the NSW Government (Kylie Russell, NSW DPI, pers. comm.). We suggest that verification of *S. glomerata* reefs in NSW should be prioritised and the *S. glomerata* sub-community type subsequently re-assessed. We note though that in order for the assessment to downgrade from its current assessment as Critically Endangered for Criteria A, the number of validates sites would need to more than double (>15), but this would not affect the over rating of Critically Endangered due to the significant historical loss.

Implications for conservation listing

The assessment of SEA Oyster Reefs as Critically Endangered, has implications for listing under environmental legislation in Australian jurisdictions. Listing under threatened species/communities or related legislation confers a number of important benefits to the ecosystem. These benefits can include: 1) preventing or limiting direct physical destruction/degradation of the system, 2) recognising, listing or addressing threatening processes that might be having an indirect role in degradation, and 3) prioritising and financing conservation and restoration activities related to the ecosystem. Furthermore, the assessment process can assist in identifying appropriate conservation policies that address specific ecosystem risks highlighted by each criterion (Alaniz et al. 2019).

Australia is a federated nation, and environmental law rests primarily with the states and territories (sub-national governments), with some overlapping national government responsibilities (such as for nationally threatened ecological communities). As such, and as there were no distinct differences in threat assessments between states, listing SEA Oyster Reefs under relevant legislation should be a high priority. Not all Australian states have legislation that enables listing of threatened marine ecological communities. The most relevant current legislation for listing is as follows: Australian Government (national level) – *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (listing application accepted for assessment in 2018); Western Australia – *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*; South Australia – *Fisheries Management Act 2007*; Victoria – *Flora and Fauna Guarantee Act 1988*; Tasmania – *Nature Conservation Act 2002*; New South Wales – *Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*; and Queensland – *Nature Conservation Act 1992* (critical habitat listing).

Despite the risk of ecosystem collapse for SEA Oyster Reefs, shellfish reefs may be one of the most restorable marine ecosystems globally. Australia's coastal environments have experienced extensive environmental change over the past 200 years, yet Australia's east coast oyster populations have demonstrated resilience to environmental stressors (e.g. McAfee et al. 2017) and readily adhere to most hard substrates. Restoration efforts in Australia and the United States demonstrate that through active restoration methods including the addition of settlement substrate and oyster larvae, many 100s of hectares can be restored within single systems (Schulte et al. 2009; Fitzsimons et al. 2019; <https://www.shellfishrestoration.org.au/>). The environmental, economic and social benefits of undertaking such restoration are well documented (Coen et al. 2007; Grabowski et al. 2012; Kroeger 2012; McLeod et al. 2019a) and interest in scaling-up marine ecosystem

restoration is growing (e.g. Fitzsimons et al. 2015; Gillies et al. 2015b). These studies and the prominent risk of total collapse identified in this study provide a compelling case for new investment that can arrest, and potentially reverse, the decline of the ecosystem.

Acknowledgments

This research was supported by the National Environmental Science Program Marine Biodiversity Hub and The Thomas Foundation. We thank three reviewers for useful comments which helped improve this manuscript.

References

- Alaniz, A.J., Pérez-Quezada, J.F., Galleguillos, M., Vásquez, A.E., Keith, D.A., 2019. Operationalizing the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems in public policy. *Conservation Letters* 12, e12665 .
- Alleway, H.K., Connell, S.D. 2015. Loss of an ecological baseline through the eradication of oyster reefs from coastal ecosystems and human memory. *Conservation Biology* 29, 795-804.
- Amaral, V., Cabral, H.N., Bishop, M.J., 2011. Resistance among wild invertebrate populations to recurrent estuarine acidification. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 93, 460-467.
- Aquatic Ecosystems Task Group 2012. Aquatic Ecosystems Toolkit. Module 2. Interim Australian National Aquatic Ecosystem Classification Framework. Australian Government Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities, Canberra.
- Birch, G.F., Scammell, M.S., Besley, C.H., 2014. The recovery of oyster (*Saccostrea glomerata*) populations in Sydney estuary (Australia). *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 21, 766-773.
- Bland, L.M., Keith, D.A., Miller, R.M., Murray, N.J., Rodríguez, J.P. (eds.) 2017. Guidelines for the Application of IUCN Red List of Ecosystems Categories and Criteria, Version 1.1.: IUCN, Gland, Switzerland.
- Brumbaugh, R.D., Beck, M.W., Coen, L.D., Craig, L. Hicks, P., 2006. A practitioners guide to the design and monitoring of shellfish restoration projects: an ecosystem services approach. The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, VA, USA.
- Baggett, L.P., Powers, S.P., Brumbaugh, R., Coen, L.D., DeAngelis, B., Greene, J., Hancock, B., Morlock S. 2014. Oyster Habitat Restoration Monitoring and Assessment Handbook. The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, VA, USA.
- Beck, M.W., Brumaugh, R.D., Airoidi, L., Carranza, A., Coen, L.D., Crawford, C., Defeo, O., Edgar, G.J., Hancock, B., Kay, M.C., Lenihan, H.S., Luckenbach, M.W., Toropova, C.L., Zhang, G. Guo, X. 2011. Oyster reefs at risk and recommendations for conservation, restoration, and management. *BioScience* 61, 107-116.
- Carnegie, R.B., Hill, K.M., Stokes, N.A., Bureson, E.M., 2014. The haplosporidian *Bonamia exitiosa* is present in Australia, but the identity of the parasite described as *Bonamia* (formerly *Mikrocytos*) *roughleyi* is uncertain. *Journal of Invertebrate Pathology* 115, 33-40.
- Chan, T.U., Hamilton, D.P., Robson, B.J., Hodges, B.R., Dallimore, C., 2002. Impacts of hydrological changes on phytoplankton succession in the Swan River, Western Australia. *Estuaries* 25, 1406-1415.
- Clark, G.F., Johnston, E.L., 2017. Australia State of the Environment 2016: Coasts. Independent report to the Australian Government Minister for Environment and Energy. Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.
- Coen, L.D., Brumbaugh, R.D., Bushek, D., Grizzle, R., Luckenbach, M.W., Posey, M.H., Powers, S.P., Tolley, S.G., 2007. Ecosystem services related to oyster restoration. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 341, 303-307.

- 615 Crawford, C., Edgar, G., Gillies, C.L., Heller-Wagner, G., 2019. Relationship of biological communities to habitat
616 structure on the largest remnant flat oyster reef (*Ostrea angasi*) in Australia. Marine and Freshwater Research,
617 doi.org/10.1071/MF19171
- 618 Cohen-Shacham, E., Andrade, A., Dalton, J., Dudley, N., Jones, M., Kumar, C., Maginnis, S., Maynard, S., Nelson,
619 C.R., Renaud, F.G., Welling, R., 2019. Core principles for successfully implementing and upscaling Nature-based
620 Solutions. Environmental Science & Policy 98, 20-29.
- 621 Dame, R.F., Zingmark, R.G. Haskin, E. 1984. Oyster reefs as processors of estuarine materials. Journal of
622 Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 83, 239-247.
- 623 Diggles, B.K. 2013. Historical epidemiology indicates water quality decline drives loss of oyster (*Saccostrea*
624 *glomerata*) reefs in Moreton Bay, Australia. New Zealand Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research 47, 561-
625 581.
- 626 Department of Climate Change, 2009. Climate change risks to Australia's coast: a first pass national
627 assessment. Australian Government, Canberra.
- 628 Dove, M.C., O'Connor, W.A., 2007. Salinity and temperature tolerance of Sydney rock oysters *Saccostrea*
629 *glomerata* during early ontogeny. Journal of Shellfish Research 26, 939-948.
- 630 Dove, M.C., Sammut, J., 2007. Impacts of estuarine acidification on survival and growth of Sydney rock oysters
631 *Saccostrea glomerata* (Gould 1850). Journal of Shellfish Research 26, 519-528.
- 632 Edgar, G.J., 1998. Australian Marine Life: The Plants and Animals of Temperate Waters. Second Edition. New
633 Holland Publishers, Sydney.
- 634 Edgar, G.J., Samson, C.R., 2004. Catastrophic decline in mollusc diversity in eastern Tasmania and its
635 concurrence with shellfish fisheries. Conservation Biology 18, 1579-1588.
- 636 Fison, C.S. 1884. Report on the oyster fisheries of Moreton Bay. Presented to both Houses of Parliament by
637 Command. Department of Ports and Harbours, Queensland.
- 638 Fitzsimons, J., Branigan, S., Brumbaugh, R., McDonald, T., zu Ermgassen, P. (eds), 2019. Restoration Guidelines
639 for Shellfish Reefs. The Nature Conservancy, Arlington VA, USA.
- 640 Fitzsimons, J., Hale, L., Hancock, B., Beck, M. 2015. Developing a marine conservation program in temperate
641 Australia: determining priorities for action. Australian Journal of Maritime and Ocean Affairs 7, 85-93.
- 642 Ford, J.R., Hamer, P., 2016. The forgotten shellfish reefs of coastal Victoria: documenting the loss of a marine
643 ecosystem over 200 years since European settlement. Proceedings of the Royal Society of Victoria, 128, 87-
644 105.

- Gillanders, B.M., Elsdon, T.S., Halliday, I.A., Jenkins, G.P., Robins, J.B., Valesini, F.J., 2011. Potential effects of climate change on Australian estuaries and fish utilising estuaries: a review. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 62, 1115-1131.
- Gillies, C.L., Creighton, C., McLeod, I.M. (eds) 2015a. Shellfish Reef Habitats: a synopsis to underpin the repair and conservation of Australia's environmentally, socially and economically important bays and estuaries. Report to the National Environmental Science Programme, Marine Biodiversity Hub. Centre for Tropical Water and Aquatic Ecosystem Research (TropWATER) Publication, James Cook University, Townsville.
- Gillies, C.L., Fitzsimons, J.A., Branigan, S., Hale, L., Hancock, B., Creighton, C., Alleway, H., Bishop, M.J., Brown, S., Chamberlain, D., Cleveland, B., Crawford, C., Crawford, M., Diggles, B., Ford, J.R., Hamer, P., Hart, A., Johnston, E., McDonald, T., Macleod, I., Pinner, B., Russell, K., Winstanley, R. 2015b. Scaling-up marine restoration efforts in Australia. *Ecological Management & Restoration* 16, 84-85.
- Gillies, C.L., Crawford, C., Hancock, B., 2017. Restoring *Angasi* oyster reefs: What is the endpoint ecosystem we are aiming for and how do we get there? *Ecological Management & Restoration* 18, 214-222.
- Gillies, C.L., McLeod, I.M., Alleway, H.K., Cook, P., Crawford, C., Creighton, C., Diggles, B., Ford, J., Hamer, P., Heller-Wagner, G., Lebrault, E., 2018. Australian shellfish ecosystems: Past distribution, current status and future direction. *PloS One* 13(2), e0190914.
- Grabowski, J.H., Brumbaugh, R.D., Conrad, R.F., Keeler, A.G., Opaluch, J.J., Peterson, C.H., Piehler, M.F., Powers, S.P., Smyth, A.R. 2012. Economic valuation of ecosystem services provided by oyster reefs. *BioScience* 62, 900-909.
- Green, T.J., Raftos, D., O'Connor, W., Adlard, R.D. and Barnes, A.C., 2011. Disease prevention strategies for QX disease (*Marteilia sydneyi*) of Sydney rock oysters (*Saccostrea glomerata*). *Journal of Shellfish Research* 30, 47-54.
- Holmes, H.B., 1927. An investigation of saw dust pollution in relation to oysters in Yaquina Bay. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Fisheries, California.
- Hobday, A.J., Lough, J.M., 2011. Projected climate change in Australian marine and freshwater environments. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 62, 1000-1014.
- Jones H., Gardner C. 2016. Small Bivalve Survey, Assessment and Stock Status Update: 2016 *Ostrea angasi* – Georges Bay *Venerupis largillierti* – Northern Zone, Georges Bay. Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, Hobart.
- Hunter, M.L., Acuña, V., Bauer, D.M., Bell, K.P., Calhoun, A.J.K., Felipe-Lucia, M.R., Fitzsimons, J.A., González, E., Kinnison, M., Lindenmayer, D., Lundquist, C.J., Medellín, R.A., Nelson, E.J., Poschod, P., 2017. Conserving small natural features with large ecological roles: a synthetic overview. *Biological Conservation* 211 (Part B), 88-95.

- 678 Kasoar T., zu Ermgassen P.S.E., Carranza A., Hancock B., Spalding M. 2015. New opportunities for conservation
679 of a threatened biogenic habitat: a worldwide assessment of knowledge on bivalve-reef representation in
680 marine and coastal Ramsar Sites. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 66, 981-988.
- 681 Keith, D.A., Rodríguez, J.P., Rodríguez-Clark, K.M., Nicholson, E., Aapala, K., Alonso, A., Asmussen, M.,
682 Bachman, S., Basset, A., Barrow, E.G., Benson, J.S., 2013. Scientific foundations for an IUCN Red List of
683 Ecosystems. *PLOS One* 8(5), e62111.
- 684 Keith, D.A., Ferrer, J.R., Nicholson, E., Bishop, M., *et al.* 2020. The IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology v1.01:
685 Descriptive profiles for Biomes and Ecosystem Functional Groups. Available from:
686 [https://iucnrl.org/static/media/uploads/references/research-](https://iucnrl.org/static/media/uploads/references/research-development/keith_etal_iucnglobalecosystemtypology_v1.01.pdf)
687 [development/keith_etal_iucnglobalecosystemtypology_v1.01.pdf](https://iucnrl.org/static/media/uploads/references/research-development/keith_etal_iucnglobalecosystemtypology_v1.01.pdf)
- 688 Kellogg, M.L., Cornwell, J.C., Owens, M.S., Paynter, K.T., 2013. Denitrification and nutrient assimilation on a
689 restored oyster reef. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 480, 1-19.
- 690 Keane, J.P., Gardner, C. 2018. 2018. Small Bivalve Fishery Assessment. Institute for Marine and Antarctic
691 Studies Report. University of Tasmania, Hobart.
- 692 Kirby, M., 2004. Fishing down the coast: Historical expansion and collapse of oyster fisheries along continental
693 margins. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 101, 13096-13099.
- 694 Kroeger, T., 2012. Dollars and Sense: Economic benefits and impacts from two oyster reef restoration projects
695 in the Northern Gulf of Mexico. The Nature Conservancy, Virginia, USA.
- 696 Lenihan, H.S., Peterson, C.H., 1998. How habitat degradation through fishery disturbance enhances impacts of
697 hypoxia on oyster reefs. *Ecological Applications* 8, 128-140.
- 698 Lergessner, J.G., 2008. Oysterers of Moreton Bay. Schuurs Publications, Brisbane..
- 699 Mansergh, I., Anderson, H., Amos, N., 2006. Victoria's living natural capital – decline and replenishment 1800-
700 2050 (Part 1). *Victorian Naturalist* 123, 4-28.
- 701 McAfee, D., Cole, V.J., Bishop, M.J., 2016. Latitudinal gradients in ecosystem engineering by oysters vary across
702 habitats. *Ecology* 97, 929-939.
- 703 McLeod, I.M., zu Ermgassen, P.S., Gillies, C.L., Hancock, B., Humphries, A., 2019a. Can bivalve habitat
704 restoration improve degraded estuaries? In: *Coasts and Estuaries: The Future* (eds E. Wolanski, J.W.. Day, M.
705 Elliott, R. Ramesh), pp. 427-442. Elsevier.
- 706 McLeod, I.M., Boström-Einarsson, L., Creighton, C., D'Anastasi, B., Diggles, B., Dwyer, P.G., Firby, L., Le Port, A.,
707 Luongo, A., Martinez-Baena, F., McOrrie, S., Heller-Wagner, G., Gillies, C.L., 2019b. Habitat value of Sydney
708 rock oyster (*Saccostrea glomerata*) reefs on soft sediments. *Marine and Freshwater Research*,
709 doi.org/10.1071/MF18197 .

- 710 Mount, R.E., Bricher, P.K. Newton, J.B., 2007. National/Intertidal/Subtidal Benthic (NISB) Habitat Classification
711 Scheme Version 1.0 October 2007. National Land and Water Resources Audit, Canberra.
- 712 Nell, J.A., 2001. The history of oyster farming in Australia. *Marine Fisheries Review* 63(3), 14-25.
- 713 Newell, R.I., 2004. Ecosystem influences of natural and cultivated populations of suspension-feeding bivalve
714 molluscs: a review. *Journal of Shellfish Research* 23, 51-61.
- 715 Newell, R.I., Koch, E.W., 2004. Modeling seagrass density and distribution in response to changes in turbidity
716 stemming from bivalve filtration and seagrass sediment stabilization. *Estuaries* 27, 793-806.
- 717 New South Wales DPI, 2016. NSW Oyster Industry Sustainable Aquaculture Strategy. Third Edition. New South
718 Wales Department of Primary Industries, Sydney.
- 719 New South Wales DPI, 2019. Oyster Reef Restoration NSW Oyster Industry Survey. Department of Planning,
720 Industry and Environment, Sydney. Available:
721 [https://www.marine.nsw.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0020/1149131/Summary-report-Oyster-reef-](https://www.marine.nsw.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0020/1149131/Summary-report-Oyster-reef-restoration-industry-survey.pdf)
722 [restoration-industry-survey.pdf](https://www.marine.nsw.gov.au/data/assets/pdf_file/0020/1149131/Summary-report-Oyster-reef-restoration-industry-survey.pdf)
- 723 New South Wales. Royal Commission on Oyster Culture, 1876-7, New South Wales. Parliament. Legislative
724 Assembly and New South Wales. Oyster Act of 1877 Report of the Royal Commission, appointed on the 29th
725 September, 1876 : to inquire into the best mode of cultivating the oyster, of utilising, improving, and
726 maintaining the natural oyster beds of the colony, and also as to the legislation necessary to carry out these
727 objects; together with the Minutes of evidence, and appendices. Charles Potter, Acting Government Printer,
728 Sydney, 1877.
- 729 Ogburn, D.M., White, I., McPhee, D.M. 2007. The disappearance of oyster reefs from eastern Australian
730 estuaries – Impact of colonial settlement or mudworm invasion? *Coastal Management* 35, 271-287
- 731 O'Connor, S., Moltschaniwskyj, N., Bolch, C.J., O'Connor, W., 2015. Assessment of temperature or salinity
732 effects on larval development by catecholamine-induced metamorphosis of hatchery-reared flat oyster, *Ostrea*
733 *angasi* (Sowerby 1871) larvae. *Aquaculture Research* 46, 2501-2511.
- 734 Parker, L.M., Ross, P.M., O'Connor W.A., 2009. The effect of ocean acidification and temperature on the
735 fertilization and embryonic development of the Sydney rock oyster *Saccostrea glomerata* (Gould 1850). *Global*
736 *Change Biology* 15, 2123-2136.
- 737 Pogoda, B., 2019. Current status of European Oyster decline and restoration in Germany. *Humanities* 8, 9.
738
- 739 Pogoda, B., Brown, J., Hancock, B., Preston, J., Pouvreau, S., Kamermans, P., Sanderson, W., von Nordheim, H.,
740 2019. The Native Oyster Restoration Alliance (NORA) and the Berlin Oyster Recommendation: bringing back a
741 key ecosystem engineer by developing and supporting best practice in Europe. *Aquatic Living Resources* 32, 13.
- 742 Powell, E.N., Kraeuter, J.N., Ashton-Alcox, K.A., 2006. How long does oyster shell last on an oyster reef?
743 *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 69, 531-542.

- 744 Powers, S.P., Peterson, C.H., Grabowski, J.H., Lenihan, H.S., 2009. Success of constructed oyster reefs in no-
745 harvest sanctuaries: implications for restoration. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 389, 159-170.
- 746 Prosser, I.P., Rutherford, I.D., Olley, J.M., Young, W.J., Wallbrink, P.J., Moran, C.J., 2001. Corrigendum to:
747 Large-scale patterns of erosion and sediment transport in river networks, with examples from Australia.
748 *Marine and Freshwater Research* 52, 817-817.
- 749 Ramsar, 2012. 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran,
750 1971) Resolution XI.8 Annex 2. Strategic Framework and guidelines for the future development of the List of
751 Wetlands of International Importance of the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran, 1971) – 2012 revision.
752 Bucharest, Romania, July 2012.
- 753 Rodríguez-Perez, A., James, M., Donnan, D.W., Henry, T.B., Møller, L.F., Sanderson, W.G., 2019. Conservation
754 and restoration of a keystone species: Understanding the settlement preferences of the European oyster
755 (*Ostrea edulis*). *Marine Pollution Bulletin* 138, 312-321.
- 756 Rodríguez, J.P., Keith, D.A., Rodríguez-Clark, K.M., Murray, N.J., Nicholson, E., Regan, T.J., Miller, R.M., Barrow,
757 E.G., Bland, L.M., Boe, K., Brooks, T.M., 2015. A practical guide to the application of the IUCN Red List of
758 Ecosystems criteria. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 370, 20140003.
- 759 Roughly T.C., 1922. Oyster culture on the Georges River NSW. Technical Education Series No. 5. Government of
760 New South Wales, Sydney.
- 761 Sammut, J., White, I., Melville, M.D., 1996. Acidification of an estuarine tributary in eastern Australia due to
762 drainage of acid sulfate soils. *Marine and Freshwater Research* 47, 669-684.
- 763 Schulte, D.M., Burke, R.P., 2014. Recruitment enhancement as an indicator of oyster restoration success in
764 Chesapeake Bay. *Ecological Restoration* 32, 434-440.
- 765 Schulte, D.M., Burke, R.P., Lipcius, R.N., 2009. Unprecedented restoration of a native oyster metapopulation.
766 *Science* 325(5944), 1124-1128.
- 767 Smith, G. 1981. Southern Queensland's oyster industry. *Journal of the Royal Historical Society of Queensland*
768 11, 45-58
- 769 Spiers, Z.B., Gabor, M., Fell, S.A., Carnegie, R.B., Dove, M., Connor, W.O., Frances, J., Go, J., Marsh, I.B., Jenkins,
770 C., 2014. Longitudinal study of winter mortality disease in Sydney rock oysters *Saccostrea glomerata*. *Diseases*
771 *of Aquatic Organisms* 110, 151-164.
- 772 Taylor, S.E., Birch, G.F., Links, F., 2004. Historical catchment changes and temporal impact on sediment of the
773 receiving basin, Port Jackson, New South Wales. *Australian Journal of Earth Sciences* 51, 233-246.
- 774 Thurstan, R., Diggles, B., Gillies, C.L., Strong, M., Kerkhove, R., Buckley, S., King, R., Smythe, V., Heller-Wagner,
775 G., Weeks, R., McLeod I. (In Press Charting two centuries of transformation in a coastal social-ecological
776 system: implications for modern management. *Global Environment Change*

- 777 Thrush, S.F., Hewitt, J.E., Cummings, V.J., Ellis, J.I., Hatton, C., Lohrer, A., Norkko, A., 2004. Muddy waters:
778 elevating sediment input to coastal and estuarine habitats. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* 2, 299-
779 306.
- 780 Warnock, B., Cook, P.A. 2015. Historical abundance and distribution of the native flat oyster, *Ostrea angasi*, in
781 the Great Southern region of Western Australia. Centre of Excellence in Natural Resource Management,
782 University of Western Australia, Albany.
- 783 Wasson, K., 2010. Informing Olympia oyster restoration: evaluation of factors that limit populations in a
784 California estuary. *Wetlands* 30, 449-459.
- 785 Watson, S.A., Southgate, P.C., Tyler, P.A., Peck, L.S., 2009. Early larval development of the Sydney rock oyster
786 *Saccostrea glomerata* under near-future predictions of CO₂-driven ocean acidification. *Journal of Shellfish*
787 *Research* 28, 431-438.
- 788 White, I., 2001. Safeguarding Environmental Conditions for Oyster Cultivation in New South Wales. Report to
789 Healthy Rivers Commission. Centre for Resource and Environmental Studies, Australian National University,
790 Canberra.
- 791 Wilkie, E.M., Bishop, M.J. and O'Connor, W.A., 2012. Are native *Saccostrea glomerata* and invasive *Crassostrea*
792 *gigas* oysters' habitat equivalents for epibenthic communities in south-eastern Australia? *Journal of*
793 *Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 420, 16-25.
- 794 zu Ermgassen, P., Hancock, B., DeAngelis, B., Greene, J., Schuster, E., Spalding, M., Brumbaugh, R.D., 2016.
795 Setting Objectives for Oyster Habitat Restoration Using Ecosystem Services: A Manager's Guide. The Nature
796 Conservancy, Arlington VA.
- 797
- 798
- 799
- 800

Figures and Tables



Figure 1. Australian flat oyster (*Ostrea angasi*) sub-community in Georges Bay, Tasmania (left; Photo: C. Gillies, The Nature Conservancy) and Sydney rock oyster (*Saccostrea glomerata*) ecosystem in Hunter River, New South Wales (Right; Photo: I. McLeod, James Cook University).




Figure 2. Cause and effect model for the Oyster Reef Ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia. Drivers (red rectangles) such as land use (including shoreline modification), climate change and exploitation influence hydrological pressures (water flow, salinity, pH, thermal, wave exposure) and Physical damage (smothering, substrate loss, siltation, abrasion) (blue hexagons), leading to ecological changes in oyster reef structure and community (green ovals). The system alters between oyster reefs and soft sediment communities (double lines) depending on the state of the ecosystem. Line arrows promote positive effect, line circles reduced effect, dashed line may increase effect (i.e. presence of mobile epifauna (e.g. predators) can enhance/reduce surface availability).




Figure 3. Current extent and historical distribution of the Oyster Reef Ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia, with each cell representing 10 sq km. Coastal embayments in blue represent potential ecosystem occupation. Data derived from Gillies et al. (2018).




Figure 4. Area of Occupancy for the Oyster Reef Ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia consisting of both sub-communities. Data derived from Gillies et al. (2018).

840 **Table 1.** Semi-qualitative reef attributes (physical form and functional features) of the Oyster Reef Ecosystem
841 of Southern and Eastern Australia which may aid the delineation of reefs ecosystems versus alternate
842 ecosystems with oyster populations.

843

844

Attribute	Fully functional reef ecosystems	Partially functional reef ecosystems	Oyster populations within alternate ecosystems	References
1. Oyster density <i>O. angasi</i> <i>S. glomerata</i>	 > 50 live oysters/m ² > 500 live oysters/m ²	 50-10 live oysters/m ² 500-100 live oysters/m ²	 <10 live oysters /m ² <100 live oysters/m ²	 $\mu \text{ m}^2 \pm \text{s.d.}$ Jones and Gardner (2016) 18.3 ± 16.7 Crawford et al. (2019) 20 ± 1 to 229 ± 7 <hr/> Summerhaze et al. (2009) 940 ± 251 McLeod et al. 2019b 10.2 ± 3.3 to 740.5 ± 15.8
2. Oyster coverage/ dominance	Oysters and oyster shell are the primary physical feature in seascape	Oysters and oyster shell partially cover seascape, interspersed with other physical, biological features	Oysters and oyster shells minor feature in seascape	Powers et al. (2009) Schultz and Burke (2014)
3. Shell budget and reef height	Increasing or stable spatial extent and/or height. Patches consist of a mix of live oysters and dead shell.		Little or no evidence of stable shell structure	Powell et al. (2006)
4. Patch number and size	Multiple patches of with vertical relief from surrounding substrate, reef patch sizes $\geq 5\text{m}^2$		Few or no discrete oyster reef/shell patches	Jones and Gardner (2016) McLeod et al. 2019b

845

846

Table 2. Assessment of threat ranking of the Oyster Reef Ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia using the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems criterion. DD = Data Deficient, LC = Least Concern, NT = Near Threatened, VU = Vulnerable, EN = Endangered, CR = Critically Endangered

Criterion	A: Reduction in extent	B: Restricted geographic distribution	C: Environmental degradation	D: Disruption of biotic processes	E: Quantitative analysis	Overall threat ranking (based on highest risk ranking)
<i>Sub-criterion</i>	1= Past 50 yrs 2= Next 50 yrs 3= Since 1750	1= Extent of Occurrence 2= Area of Occupancy 3= # threat locations	1= Past 50 yrs 2= Next 50 yrs 3= Since 1750	1= Past 50 yrs 2= Next 50 yrs 3= Since 1750	1= ≤50% in 50 yrs 2= ≤20% in 50 yrs 3= ≤10% within 100yrs	
1	DD	LC	DD	DD	DD	CR
2	DD	EN	DD	DD	DD	
3	CR	VU	VU	CR	DD	

857

858

859

860

861

Journal Pre-proof

862 **Table 3. Current and future environmental threats and their impacts on the Oyster Reefs Ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia. See *Historical***
 863 ***and Current Threatening Processes* section for references.**

Threat	Future trend	Abiotic response	Biotic response
Climate and weather	Increasing	Altered pH, altered salinity, smothering from sediment associated with floods, reduced water quality, heat stress, loss of hard surfaces for recruitment	Oyster stress, decline in physical oyster condition and mortality, shift towards sediment responsive faunal community, increased (oyster) disease prevalence.
Erosion and inundation regime	Increasing	Smothering from sediment, loss of hard surfaces for recruitment, physical disturbance	Oyster stress and mortality, shift towards sediment responsive fauna.
Sediment transport	Increasing	smothering from sediment, loss of hard surfaces for recruitment	Oyster stress and mortality, shift towards sediment responsive fauna, increased oyster predator prevalence (e.g. mud worm)
Coastal river and estuary pollution	Increasing	Toxicity, increased bioavailability of pollutants	Oyster and ecological community stress, decline in physical condition and mortality
Flow regimes	Increasing	Altered salinity, water	Oyster stress and mortality,

		quality, heat stress	ecological community stress and mortality
Water abstraction	Increasing	Altered salinity, water quality, thermal stress, stratification	Oyster stress and mortality, ecological community stress and mortality
Low-oxygen dead zones	Stable	Oxygen supply	Mortality, loss of community diversity

864

865

866

867 **Table 4.** Levels of catchment degradation and estuary shoreline modification corresponding to IUCN risk criteria for current and extant locations of the Oyster Reef
 868 Ecosystem of Southern and Eastern Australia. Categories: 0-30% = Least Concern; 31-50% = Vulnerable; 51-80% = Endangered; 81-100% = Critically Endangered.

Location	% catchment modification	Catchment rating	% estuary shoreline modification	Shoreline rating
Moreton Bay, Queensland	7	LC	75	EN
Richmond River, New South Wales	67	EN	76	EN
Port Stephens, New South Wales	49	VU	25	LC
Hunter River, New South Wales	64	EN	79	EN
Botany Bay, New South Wales	77	EN	89	CR
Crookhaven River, New South Wales	46	VU	34	VU
Georges Bay, Tasmania	42	VU	34	VU
All current and previous known sites	(N= 198)		(N=178)	
	15.2 (30)	CR	19.1 (34)	CR
	39.4 (78)	EN	51.1 (91)	EN
	35.4 (70)	VU	15.7 (28)	VU

(% of total)	10.1 (20)	LC	14.0 (25)	LC
---------------------	-----------	----	-----------	----

869

870

871

872

Declaration of interests

☒ The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

☐ The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests: